

INVESTIGATION OF SHOCKS AT  
HIGH TEMPERATURES.

Charles Joseph Beers

Thesis  
B35

Thesis  
B35



Library  
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School,  
Annapolis, Md.

INVESTIGATION OF SHOCKS AT  
HIGH TEMPERATURES

BY

CHARLES JOSEPH BEERS  
LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, U.S.N.

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF RENSSELAER  
POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

JUNE 1948

TROY, N.Y.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to Professor N. P. Bailey, Head of Department of Mechanical Engineering, for his enlightenment and encouragement. Also to Professors J.J. Devine and W.J. Bordt for their capable assistance.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	
Introduction	1
Equipment	3
Procedure	6
Discussion	8
Results	19
Conclusions	30
Recommendations	31
Bibliography	32
Sample Calculations	
Tables	
Sketches	

## INVESTIGATION OF SHOCKS AT HIGH TEMPERATURES

### SUMMARY

This investigation was conducted to verify and explain, if possible, the increase in total temperature found in shock diamonds as discovered by previous investigators.<sup>(1)(2)</sup>

This report was limited to the burning of kerosene-air and hydrogen-air combustion mixtures, at pressure ratios from 1.6 to 3.0 and burner temperatures from 200°F to 1450°F. All total temperatures were recorded by chromel-alumel thermocouples; total and static pressures were measured by pitot and pitot-static tubes.

An increase in total temperature was found to exist in shock diamonds when burning a combustion mixture of kerosene and air. When a combustion mixture of hydrogen and air was burned, no increase in total temperature was detected. These results indicate that the afterburning of carbon monoxide is the most plausible explanation of the shock diamond phenomenon and that further investigation of this theory should definitely be conducted. Incomplete combustion and ionization are possible but not probable causes.

# INVESTIGATION OF SHOCKS AT HIGH TEMPERATURES

## INTRODUCTION

When a gas flows through an orifice or parallel-walled nozzle under a pressure ratio greater than that needed to produce sonic velocity, the sudden adjustment of the gas pressure to the lower back pressure produces a variety of angle shock patterns.<sup>(1)</sup> When these shock patterns or "diamonds" occur in high temperature products of combustion, it has been found, through the investigations of Bailey<sup>(1)</sup> and Bundy<sup>(2)</sup>, that a definite total temperature rise occurs in the so-called shock diamonds. Bailey has reported excess temperatures in the first shock diamond of 200 to 300 degrees greater than burner temperature, burning a mixture of propane and air at a pressure ratio of 3.75. The report also indicated that the amount of excess temperature varied as the strength of the compression shock, but appeared to be independent of burner temperature. Essentially the same results were obtained for carbon monoxide-air and kerosene-air mixtures.

Bundy has reported total temperature increases in shock diamonds on the order of 150 degrees, burning alcohol and oxygen at a pressure ratio of 2.5 and burner temperature of 3000°K. However, he reported that exhaust gas temperatures have never exceeded burner temperatures. The temperature increase was calculated from observed temperature in the gas stream before and after shock.

The above investigations concerning this phenomenon are the only ones known to have been conducted to date.



The purpose of this report is to investigate the results found by Bailey and Bundy and if substantiated by experiment, to explain the phenomenon theoretically assisted by experimental results. This report will be limited to the temperature increases reported in shock diamonds.

This project was conducted during the period January to June 1948 at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York.

## EQUIPMENT

Equipment consisted essentially of the following:

2" diameter burner, burner extension, air metering device, voltage regulator for spark ignition, fuel pump, fuel scale, straight tube and U tube mercury manometers, thermocouples, static and total pressure tubes, potentiometer, burner extension orifice caps and air compressor. A photograph of assembled apparatus is shown on plates I and II. A schematic sketch is shown on plate V.

Burner and burner liner are shown on plate III. The burner, steel, 2" in diameter and 8" in length, had provisions for spark plug installation and air and fuel supply as shown. The burner liner (plate III) 1/32" inconel, was conical in shape, perforated, and threaded at after end at which point it was secured to the burner fuel nozzle tip. (plate III)

Burner extension (plate III and IV) consisted of a 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " by 2" steel pipe, attached to the burner by a steel coupling. The outer end was threaded to accommodate orifice caps. Thermocouple and pressure taps were provided as shown on plate III. Overall length of burner and burner extension was 15", measured from air inlet to orifice.

Air metering device was of conventional type, consisting of a 3/4" metering nozzle. Voltage regulator for spark ignition consisted of a powerstat, (type 116, PR1. V. 115, max. output 7.5 A.) and an ignition transformer (type 638-171, Jefferson Electric Co., Bellwood, Ill.) Fuel supply was composed of fuel tank, and conventional centrifugal pump (max.

pressure 100 lbs. per sq. in.), driven by a 115 volt General Electric Motor. Fuel pressure (kerosene) was measured by conventional bourdon gauge. All of the above parts are shown on plates I and II.

Various sizes of nozzle fuel tips were used of standard commercial type. In construction they were identical with industrial tips, except for threading of the forward end to receive the burner liner. Sizes used were, .75, 1.00, 1.20, 1.50, 1.65 and 2.5, all gallons per hour. While burning hydrogen, a conventional gas burner tip was used, the latter being supplied by industrial type hydrogen cylinder. Fuel tips of gas and liquid types are shown on plate III.

Straight tube mercury manometers (2) were of the conventional type, capable of reading 60" Hg gage. Conventional U tube mercury manometers were used, capable of 30" Hg differential pressure. All temperature measurements were made with 1/8" unshielded, chromel-alumel thermocouples (plate III). A Leeds and Northrup Potentiometer Indicator was used to record the thermocouple voltages. Four burner extension orifice caps were provided (plate IV). They consisted of standard 2" brass pipe caps, each having a different size orifice. Orifice sizes (diameter) were .4", .5", .6", and .7". Outside and inside surfaces were finished, the latter surface had a 11° taper toward the center. Taper extended to within 1/8" of orifice, the remaining 1/8" tip was 1/32" thick.

Total pressure was measured with a steel pitot tube (plate IV), 3/4" in length, .100" outside diameter and .046" inside diameter. Static pressure was measured with a steel

pitot static tube (plate IV),  $1\frac{1}{4}$ " in length, .100" outside diameter. Pressure tap, .040" in diameter, was located  $\frac{3}{4}$ " aft of leading edge. Air supply was obtained by a Schramm Air Compressor, Model 210, rated capacity 206 cubic feet of free air per minute, driven by a 50 H.P. Westinghouse Induction Motor.

Thermocouple and pressure tubes were held firmly in the gas stream by a sliding plate arrangement which provided freedom of motion in three planes. Sliding plates were scribed in .025" increments. This apparatus is shown on plate II.

Instrumentation location is shown on plate V. Static pressure  $P_1$  was measured by straight tube mercury manometer,  $P_1^1$  and  $P_2$  were connected to U tube mercury manometer, as were  $P_2^1$  and  $P_3$ .  $P_4$  and  $P_{o4}$ , pressures in the exhaust flow were measured by a second straight tube mercury manometer.  $T_{o2}$ ,  $T_{o3}$  and  $T_{o4}$  were obtained by means of thermocouples. Total and static pressure tubes were placed in the exhaust gas stream in the same manner as shown for thermocouples.

Combustion mixtures consisted of kerosene-air and hydrogen-air.

## PROCEDURE

Experimental runs were made using various pressure ratios, ( $P_3/P_a$ ) and various burner temperatures ( $T_{o3}$ ). Pressure ( $P_1$ ) was varied to obtain desired  $P_3$  and thus  $P_3/P_a$ . Fuel pressure was then varied until desired burner temperature ( $T_{o3}$ ) existed. Actually since  $P_3$  and  $T_{o3}$  are dependent on each other, it was necessary to vary both simultaneously to obtain desired conditions. Temperature traverses ( $T_{o4}$ ), in longitudinal plane only, were then taken each .100" measuring out from orifice. The position of the highest temperature in the gas stream did not correspond to the center of the orifice as had been expected. Thus it was first necessary to traverse the orifice area to determine position of greatest temperature and then traverse longitudinally. This position was checked each .50" and corrected if necessary. However, the variation over the 2.0" length traversed was slight. Total and static pressure traverses were made in the same manner.

In addition to varying the fuel and air pressure, it was necessary to vary the fuel nozzle tip size and the orifice size, in order to cover the range of burner temperatures and pressure ratios desired. A small amount of supply air was continuously bled off. This insured a steady air supply as then the compressor ran continuously. However, due to the combustion, fluxations existed in the air supply pressure ( $P_1$ ) of  $\pm 1/2$ " Hg. Burner temperature was held constant insofar as possible. During some runs, the burner approached

instability resulting in burner temperature fluxuations. However, during all runs, the variations were held within the expected experimental accuracy.

Fuel pressure was varied from 30 lbs. per sq. in. to 100 lbs. per sq. in. Air pressure ( $P_1$ ) was varied to give a range of pressure ratios ( $P_3/P_a$ ) from 3.0 to 1.6. The expected amount of difficulty was encountered in spark ignition and maintenance of thermocouples. Due to prolonged operation at high temperatures (1500° F) it was necessary to replace two burner liners.

## DISCUSSION

## I. Possible Theories to Explain Total Temperature Increases in Shock Diamonds.

## A. Incomplete Burning

It is quite possible to account for increased total temperature in a shock diamond if burning is not complete in the burner. Unburned carbon would combine with the oxygen in the exhaust gas stream and produce additional heat. This burning of carbon would be accentuated in regions of high pressure, e.g. in the shock diamonds, causing the total temperature to increase above that noted for regions of lower pressure.

However, all possible precautions were taken to realize complete combustion. Different size burner extensions were tested during which tests, cross sectional temperature traverses of the burner proper and burner extension were made. The length of the burner extension was increased until maximum burner extension temperature was lower than the maximum burner temperature. This was considered at least an indication of complete burning. Throughout all runs, thermocouple readings indicated a temperature drop in the burner extension.

## DISCUSSION (Continued)

Incomplete combustion, as defined in this report, means the combustion of the original hydrocarbons in the exhaust stream. No heat balance was attempted as the calculation of exact burner temperature was considered highly difficult, if not impossible. Assuming correct burner temperature, other variables involved make obtained results highly uncertain.



## B. Ionization

It is possible that the violent deceleration of the hot gases in the shock could produce such a high concentration of ions that their bombardment and neutralization at the thermocouple metal surface could cause the metal to reach a very high temperature before energy equilibrium is reached.

The exact mechanism of the formation of ions due to this deceleration is vague and unknown. A possible explanation could involve the collision of the molecules at the shock front. That is, the high velocity molecules colliding with those molecules which have been greatly de-accelerated at the shock front. However, it is assumed that for collision of molecules of comparable mass, there is a greater chance of the excitation of one of the molecules to an electronic state in which the nuclear separation is different from the initial value. This assumption seems to be justified experimentally by the spectrographic observation in flame sources of band systems which do not appear readily in other sources in which excitation is by electrical impact.<sup>(3)</sup>

The ionization potential of the molecules or atoms which can be identified in flame sources are known to be quite high, greater than 10 volts or 230 K cal.<sup>(20)</sup> Thus a large amount of energy is needed to produce ions. The most plausible source of ions is from  $C_2$  and thus we may expect more ionization in fuels containing carbon. It

has also been found that a considerable fraction of the kinetic energy of impacting ions is retained after impact by the neutralized atom, the remaining fraction of kinetic energy is delivered to the thermocouple as heat. This latter fraction is analogous to the accommodation co-efficient, which is recognized in the impact of ordinary gas molecules against a heated surface. For ions of high molecular weight these co-efficients appear to approach unity. Thus these results imply that when ions bombard a thermocouple, mechanical momentum is imparted to the thermocouple to a much larger extent than heretofore had been suspected.<sup>(7)</sup> According to Compton, the following factors contribute to the heating of a thermocouple in an ionized gas: (1) the fraction of the incident KE of the ion which is delivered to the electrode (accommodation co-efficient) and (2) the true heat of neutralization of the ion at the surface.

Thus there seems to be small doubt that if the ions are present in sufficient numbers, a rise in total temperature would result. However, at this time experiment and theory appear to disfavor a large concentration of ions. Although ionization potentials are known for many substances, the calculations of the deceleration in a shock front and the resulting energy is most difficult to calculate. This is due to the fact that the thickness of the

shock front, which would be the distance necessary<sup>12.</sup>  
to compute the deceleration is most indefinite.  
The measurement of the degree of ionization in the  
gas stream would be a definite step forward in  
determining the validity of this theory. However,  
this measurement is not without many difficulties  
and no indications have been found of experiments  
along this line.

### C. The lack of equipartition of energy:

Since it is definitely known that molecules possess varying degrees of translational, rotational and vibrational energy, it is entirely possible that these three forms of energy are not in equilibrium at all times. Thus, since temperature is only a measure of translational energy based on the Maxwellian theory of distribution, it is possible for a molecule to have more energy than temperature would indicate. Therefore, it is possible to think of the molecules as having higher vibrational and rotational energy than translational energy (not in equilibrium), as it leaves the orifice and then to have the shock equalize the energy distribution by converting some of the vibrational and rotational energy into translational energy, and thus increasing observed total temperature.

### D. The Theory of Unstable Oxides of Nitrogen:

A possible explanation of temperature rise in shock diamonds is that some unstable oxides of nitrogen are formed in the region of shock due to the violent deceleration. This cause has been eliminated by Bailey.<sup>(1)</sup> He burned propane with pure oxygen and observed exactly the same phenomenon.

### E. The After Burning of Carbon Monoxide:<sup>(3)</sup>

In the combustion of ordinary fuels containing hydrogen as well as carbon, it is generally agreed upon that the combustion of carbon monoxide occurs largely through the maintenance of the water gas

equilibrium. Also, there appears to exist a mechanism by which carbon monoxide and oxygen can react to form carbon dioxide. The exact form of this mechanism is doubtful, but experimental results have shown it to be quite possible.<sup>(26)</sup>

By use of spectro-analysis it has been found that the normal carbon monoxide molecule, which must be the final product of combustion regardless of the mechanism, is not built up from normal carbon monoxide and normal oxygen but from an excited state. Thus in the formation of carbon dioxide from the monoxide, an electronic transition must occur at some stage during the reaction. Since there is no spectroscopic evidence for the presence of electronically excited carbon monoxide molecules, it seems unlikely that the carbon monoxide molecules are first activated. Therefore, we are left to conclude that the carbon dioxide molecules are formed initially in a state which is not the normal electronic state of carbon dioxide. Thus the basic assumption of this theory is the fact that the carbon dioxide molecules are initially formed in an electronically excited state.

The electronic transition which must occur is therefore assumed to occur to this activated carbon dioxide molecule. The transition is from the excited state of carbon dioxide to the linear symmetrical ground state and is thought to occur either through collision or by radiation of the excess energy. In any case, the deactivation results in

the carbon dioxide molecule being in a state of high vibrational excitation. (Franch-Condon principle). This excess vibrational energy may persist for as long as  $10^{-4}$  seconds for pure dry carbon monoxide, before equipartition with the energy in the other degrees of freedom (heat energy). In the presence of moisture or catalyst molecules, the excess vibrational energy will mostly be lost by collision and transferred into heat in a very much shorter time. However, there is reason to believe that this temporary lack of equipartition of the energy may lead to abnormally high dissociation of the carbon dioxide molecules. There exists direct experimental proof that abnormal dissociation in explosion flames of carbon monoxide burning in air does occur.

It is the internal vibrational energy of the molecules which governs the amount of dissociation and thus, although the temperature of a gas as normally recorded may be such as to expect a very small amount of the dissociation of carbon dioxide, the effective vibrational temperature may be very much higher and the equilibrium value of the amount of dissociation considerably greater. The carbon dioxide molecules are believed to dissociate into either oxygen atoms and carbon monoxide molecules or into normal oxygen and excited carbon monoxide. The recombination of the carbon monoxide and oxygen result in after burning.

Thus after burning can be readily explained in terms of this abnormal dissociation, for although the life of the vibrationally activated molecules themselves is probably less than a second, the successive dissociation and recombination of the molecules will prolong the combustion process. The degree of after burning is directly affected by the pressure. More carbon monoxide and oxygen will combine in regions of high pressure due to the shift of the dissociation equilibrium.

It has been said that presence of a catalyst or moisture will deactivate the vibrationally excited carbon dioxide molecule more quickly due to collisions and therefore it is to be expected that abnormal dissociation will not be as great. Thus, for ordinary fuels, the after burning affect will be less than for pure carbon monoxide.

## II. Measurement of Flame Temperature.(3)

The measurement of the temperature of a flame is one of the least satisfactory of physical measurements. This is the result of the difficulty in defining a temperature of a flame and also the fact that there exist many experimental difficulties. In a combustion process large amounts of energy are released and this energy can take several forms. The molecule may possess abnormal vibrational energy and not be in equilibrium, therefore a measurement of the translational energy would not be a true representation of the energy of the molecule. Thus it is evident that a flame temperature may have three possible values corresponding to the effective rotational, vibrational and translational temperature of the molecules. Since temperature is defined as the heat produced by the translational energy of the molecules, assuming a Maxwellian distribution, it is evident that temperature as measured may not be a true value.

Flames may contain many chemically reactive bodies such as the radicals OH and CH, which may react with any surface put in the flame such as a thermocouple, liberate energy and raise the temperature of the thermocouple above that of the flame. The recombination on the thermocouple surface of abnormally dissociated molecules will also affect the observed temperature.



The thermocouple loses heat by radiation, the correction for which is rather uncertain. It also loses heat by conduction into the cooler supporting leads, but this loss is so small in comparison to others that it may be neglected. In high velocity measurement corrections are required for the cooling affect.<sup>(1)</sup> This latter effect involves the fact that total temperature exists only at the nose of the thermocouple and the sides will come into equilibrium at a temperature above the static temperature. Thus the thermocouple will indicate a value less than true total temperature.

From the above, it is evident that, qualitatively, the values obtained by the use of thermocouples is indeed of doubtful reliability. Fortunately, however, this report is primarily concerned with temperature comparison rather than exact values. Although it is of importance to consider the thermocouple limitations when interpreting results, it is felt that thermocouples are sufficiently accurate to indicate temperature trends.

## RESULTS

The following experimental runs are included in this report:

Fig. No.	Pressure Ratio(Po3/Pa)	Orifice	Burner		Remarks
			Fuel	Temp.°F	
1 & 2	2.85	.6"	Kerosene	790	(1)
3	2.93	.4"	"	1002	(2)
4 & 5	2.93	.4"	"	1450	(3)
3	2.99	.4"	Hydrogen	990	(4)
4 & 6	2.99	.4"	"	1460	(5)
2A	1.64	.7"	Kerosene	790	(6)

- (1) Total temperature, total pressure, and static pressure traverses made.
- (2) Total temperature traverse only.
- (3) Total temperature and static pressure traverse made.
- (4) Total temperature traverse only.
- (5) Total temperature and total pressure traverses made.
- (6) Total temperature traverse only.

Figure (1) verifies previous reports as it is readily seen that when a gas flows through an orifice under a pressure ratio greater than that required to produce sonic velocity, the sudden adjustment of the gas pressure produces a variety of angle shock patterns. The pressure traverses also indicate that the first angle compression shock originates from the jet boundary. Figure (2) indicates that a total temperature rise occurs in the region of high pressure in back of the shock waves. Each "hump" in the temperature curve agrees exactly with the position of the shock diamond. This same result was observed for varying pressure ratios of 3.0 to 1.9 with burner temperatures of 200°F to 1450°F, using kerosene as fuel. Figure (2A) is the total temperature traverse at the same burner temperature as in figure (2) but at a pressure ratio of 1.64. The variations of total temperature are slight,

approaching the magnitude of potentiometer fluxuations.

The apparent rise in the total temperature curve as distance from orifice increases is due to two causes. First, the thermocouple was placed in the center of the orifice at zero position, which was later found not to be the hottest portion of the gas stream. Second, the traverse was not parallel to the stream. This combination resulted in the thermocouple reading lower than the maximum temperature at zero distance and reading higher temperatures as it traveled across the stream into regions of higher temperature as the traverse progressed.

This revelation was quite surprising but was traced back to the burner liner which was not centered in the burner. This latter fact caused the inlet air to be unevenly distributed about the burning zone, and shifted the hot portion of the flame off center. All other temperature readings in this report were taken in the hottest portion of the exhaust gas stream.

It is to be noted that the total temperature in figure (2) drops off sharply at  $d = 2.4$ " which as seen on figure (1) is the position of the last major shock. This is typical of all experimental runs using kerosene, and indicates the influence of shocks on total temperature increases. Comparing the amount of temperature increase to the strength of the shocks in figures (1) and (2), a definite relationship between the two is indicated.

Experimental results indicate that the attempt to obtain complete combustion was successful. The gas stream for both

the combustion of kerosene and hydrogen was not visible except in a darkened room. Under the latter conditions the kerosene exhaust was characterized by a bright yellow color. The regions of high pressure, that is the shock diamonds, were distinctly outlined as the brightness was more intense. Five to seven shock diamonds were distinctly visible. The hydrogen exhaust however, was identified by a pale blue stream. The shock diamonds were barely visible, the color being a slightly deeper blue. The insertion of the thermocouple in the exhaust stream, under the darkened condition above, did not affect the color of the flame for either hydrogen or kerosene. If the combustion of the original hydrocarbons was taking place, the insertion of the thermocouple would most certainly accentuate the combustion in the immediate region and affect the color of the flame.

It was observed on all runs with kerosene, in which total temperature traverses were taken out to a distance of 4.0" from the orifice, that a sharp break occurred in the temperature curve in the interval between 2.5" and 3.0". It is believed that the existence of incomplete combustion in the gas stream would result in a more gradual decrease of total temperature. Throughout all runs, thermocouple readings indicated a temperature drop in the burner extension.

Under conditions of high pressure ratio, that is high burner pressure, the combustion would tend to become more complete. However, this condition in general, resulted in a greater total temperature increase in the shock diamonds.

However, it is realized that the above results are not

positive proof of complete burning, but only tend to confirm the attempts to complete combustion insofar as possible. It is thought that the affects of incomplete combustion in the gas stream, if at all present, are slight and may be neglected.

Figure (3) compares the gas stream total temperature resulting from the combustion of kerosene and of hydrogen. The kerosene curve is typical of many runs, exhibiting the total temperature increase in the shock diamonds. However, the hydrogen curve is almost flat, the variations are negligible, being no larger than the normal potentiometer fluxuations encountered. Figure (4) is the comparison of the same fuels at a different burner temperature. It is seen that the same result occurs. In both of the above comparisons, the same pressure ratio of 2.9 was used. Figure (5) shows the static pressure traverse for the kerosene run and figure (6) shows the total pressure traverse for the hydrogen run. These traverses verify the fact that shock diamonds were being formed during these particular runs. Bailey's experiments verify the above results. He burned a mixture of hydrogen and air, and observed no temperature increases in the shock diamonds.

These results indicate that the type of fuel undoubtedly plays a major part in total temperature increase in shock diamonds. Of course, the major difference in the above fuels is that kerosene contains carbon and hydrogen does not. Thus the discrepancy can be very well explained by the theory of the after burning of carbon monoxide. The decrease in total temperature before the shock diamond is encountered, as shown in figure (3) for kerosene, is typical of all runs with this

fuel. As outlined previously, recombination of carbon monoxide and oxygen will be accentuated in regions of high pressure and decreased in regions of low pressure. Since the pressure drops as the velocity increases approaching the first shock, this theory would predict a drop in total temperature. Since the pressure is increased in the diamond, one should expect a total temperature rise. A minor contribution to the above decrease in temperature is the cooling affect on the thermocouple when in high velocity flow. In fact, the slight variation of the hydrogen curves may be a result of this cooling affect. The re-occurrence of this temperature rise in each succeeding shock can be explained by the fact that the successive dissociation and recombination of the molecules will prolong the combustion process. It is also possible that the violent accelerations and decelerations aid in the above dissociations. It has been shown in figures (1) and (2) that the greater the intensity of the shock the greater the temperature rise. This result is expected as the greater the pressure, the more carbon monoxide and oxygen will combine and thus a higher total temperature.

Temperature increases of 100 to 150 degrees in shock diamonds have been observed in previous reports (1) (2), at pressure ratio of three, where as experiments contained in this report show a smaller increase of 45 to 75 degrees. However, since the presence of impurities or moisture greatly reduces the abnormal dissociation of the carbon dioxide, this variation is to be expected. It is entirely possible that the kerosene and inlet air used in previous experiments

contained less impurities and moisture. Also the burner temperatures in above reports were in the vicinity of 2400 to 3000°R which would increase considerably the degree of dissociation.

In figures (3) and (4), referring to the kerosene runs, the temperature of the gas stream at the orifice is 1024°F for a burner temperature of 1002°F and is 1632°F for a burner temperature of 1450°F. The hydrogen curves, although below the burner temperature are seen to approach the latter as burner temperature is increased from 1002°F to 1450°F. The explanation of this is not readily apparent. It appears to be a result of incomplete combustion but experimental results have shown the combustion to be very nearly complete if not entirely complete. After burning could hardly explain it, as there appears to be more after burning for the burner temperature of 1002°F than for the run at 1450°F., as shown by the relative temperature increase in the shock diamond. Hydrogen exhibits the same tendency which is even more difficult to connect with incomplete combustion and after burning. It would seem more plausible that the burner temperature is incorrect. It has been shown that the hottest portion of the flame varied in the gas stream. It is then logical that it will also vary in the burner. Since the thermocouples in the burner were fixed in the center of the burner, it is possible that the recorded temperature was low. Bailey reported instances of the gas stream temperature being up to 1000 degrees greater than burner temperature. Burner temperatures in these experiments were calculated from accurate

heat balances, however no thermocouple readings were taken in the burner to verify the heat balance results. Assuming the burner temperatures were correct, this phenomenon defies all present day theories.

Potentiometer fluxuations in the gas stream were of larger magnitude when burning kerosene, than when burning hydrogen. However, the burner temperature fluxuations were small and of the same magnitude for both kerosene and hydrogen. This could indicate that some form of activity is occurring in the kerosene exhaust stream, conforming to the after burning theory.

It has been mentioned that the kerosene exhaust stream was characterized by a bright yellow glow, the intensity of which was much greater in the shock diamonds. That this could well be the after burning of carbon monoxide has been definitely indicated by the experiments of Withrow and Rossweiler. (3) They used a stroboscopic method which enabled them to study the spectrum of the light emitted from the combustion chamber of an internal combustion engine, at any stage during the charge. Ordinary photographs revealed that there was a marked re-illumination of the gases through which the flame had passed, this occurring during the pressure rise, accompanying the rapid burning of the last part of the charge. Spectrographs were taken of the flame front and of this so-called after glow. The after glow of all the organic fuels studied showed only the carbon monoxide flame spectrum and the OH bands. The CH and C<sub>2</sub> bands which characterized the flame front were not present in the after glow. This indicates that the light emitted after the flame has



passed through the charge is not due to oxidation of the original hydrocarbons.

The above after glow is analagous to that found in kerosene exhaust gases, the regions of high pressure accentuating the combustion of carbon monoxide and oxygen, resulting in a more pronounced after glow.

The exhaust gases of the hydrogen exhibited no after glow which is, of course, predicted by the carbon monoxide theory. The slightly deeper blue color in the shock diamonds can readily be explained. Since the pressure in the shock diamonds is greater than that in the surrounding vicinity, the density is also greater, thus a greater degree of radiation.

It is of interest to note that Bailey reported the high pressure shock diamonds were usually visible, but instances occurred, under apparently the same conditions, when the diamonds were not visible or barely so. This would indicate a hidden variable, most likely concerned with the composition of the combustion mixture. This can be explained by the carbon monoxide theory. It has been shown that moisture and impurities exert a great influence, and a large decrease in the amount of after burning. Therefore, any appreciable change in the physical properties of the combustion mixture could account for the disappearance of the visible shock diamonds.

Table I contains a compulation of the results obtained with various pressure ratios and burner temperatures. In general it is seen that greater pressure ratios result in

greater temperature increases, as indicated by figure (7). The latter is true for burner temperature from 800 - 1450°F. It is seen at lower burner temperature, pressure ratio appears to have little or no effect, the magnitude of temperature increases is approaching the potentiometer fluxuation.

At higher pressure ratios the total temperature increase is expected to be greater than for lower pressure ratios in accordance with the carbon monoxide theory. Since the abnormal dissociation would be greater at higher temperature, the theory predicts greater temperature increases for higher burner temperature. No attempt has been made to verify the latter statement due to insufficient experimental results. However, figure 7 indicates a trend in the right direction. The spread of points seen in figure 7 could be the result of two factors, the burner temperature variation, and the possibility of varying physical and chemical properties of the combustion mixture.

Comparing figures 2 and 2A, it is seen that for the latter the total temperature at the orifice is lower than for the former, both at the same burner temperature. Since the burner pressure is much less for a pressure ratio of 1.64, the rate of recombination of carbon monoxide and oxygen is less, resulting in lower total temperature.

The results of this report throw very little light on the theory of ionization. Since it is known that hydrocarbon fuels are more likely to ionize than are hydrogen fuels, ionization could possibly play a part in the observed results. Due to lack of fundamental knowledge of ionization in a high velocity gas stream, the theory seems to be neither

proved or disproved. It is felt that ionization could at least play a minor role in producing total temperature increase in shock diamonds. However, until more direct evidence is available, this can only be a speculation.

The lack of equipartition of energy theory appears to break down because of two considerations. First, it seems more logical that a shock would tend to place the molecule further from equilibrium, thus lower the translational energy and the total temperature. The second, which is more convincing involves the relaxation time of a molecule. The relaxation time is defined as the time interval required for the conversion of vibrational energy into thermal or translational energy. In other words, the time for a molecule to reach equilibrium. The actual time has been calculated; it will of course vary for different molecules and for the conditions which exist. However, it is fairly well agreed upon that the required time lies between  $10^{-8}$  and  $10^{-13}$  seconds. It can be shown that the time required for a molecule to reach the first shock is of the order of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  secs. The latter is based on experimental results, which indicate that a distance of .5" is required before the appearance of the first diamond. The mach number used in the calculations was that of the stream just before hitting the shock, thus its greatest value. It is apparent that  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  seconds is the shortest possible time, the actual time no doubt being of greater duration. However, using this figure, it is readily seen that the molecule will already be in equilibrium before it reaches the shock diamond.

Thus any increase in translational energy and therefore total temperature should have occurred before reaching the shock.

In conclusion it may be said that the after burning of carbon monoxide is the most likely of the presented theories which can explain the increased total temperature found to exist in shock diamonds. In view of the meager experimental evidence conducted in this field to date, it must be admitted that ionization and after burning are still possibilities. In fact, the influence of the above three theories could well be combined to produce the observed phenomenon.

## CONCLUSIONS

When a gas flows through an orifice under a pressure ratio greater than that needed to produce sonic velocity, the sudden adjustment of the gas pressure to the lower back pressure produces a variety of angle shock patterns. When these shock patterns occur in high temperature products of kerosene-air combustion, total temperature increases in the regions of high pressure, e.g. behind the shock wave. When these shock patterns exist in high temperature products of hydrogen-air combustion, total temperature does not increase.

These results indicate that the after burning of carbon monoxide is the most plausible explanation of the shock diamond phenomenon and that further investigation of this theory should definitely be conducted. Incomplete combustion and ionization are possible but not probable causes.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Conduct an investigation to determine the spectro character of the region within the shock diamond.  
Thus it could be definitely determined if the increased total temperature is due to after burning of carbon monoxide or combustion of original hydrocarbons.
2. Conduct an investigation to determine the degree of ionization in a high velocity exhaust gas stream containing shock diamonds.
3. Conduct an investigation into the problem of gas stream temperature measurements which are of greater value than the burner temperature. An accurate method of determining burner temperature would be a necessary requisite.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Bailey, N.P., Head of Department of Mechanical Engineering, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.
- (2) Bundy, F.P., Research Laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N.Y.
- (3) Gaydon, A.G., Spectroscopy and Combustion Theory, Chapman and Hall Ltd., 1942;  
Proc. Roy. Soc. A178,61 (1941); Nature 148,226 (1941).
- (4) Greeves, F.D. and Johnston, J.E., Phil Mag. 21, 659, 1936.
- (5) Sloane, R.H. and Emmeleus, K.G., Phep.Rev. 44, 333, 1933.
- (6) Mason, R.C., Phep. Rev. 51, 28, 1937.
- (7) Compton, K.T. and LaMar, E.S., Science 71, 517, 1930;  
Phep. Rev. 37, 1069, 1931.
- (8) Saha, M.N., Phil. Mag. 40, 472, 809, 1920;  
Proc. Roy. Soc. A99, 135, 1921.
- (9) Suits, G.G., Physics, 6, 190, 315, 1935.
- (10) Loeb, L.B., Fundamental Processes of Electrical Discharge in Gases ; J. Wiley & Sons, Inc., N.Y. 1939;  
~~Kinetic~~ Kinetic Theory of Gases, McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc. 1927, N.Y.
- (11) Kantrowitz, A., Effects of Heat Capacity Tag in Gas Dynamics, Jan. 1944.
- (12) David, W.T. and Mann, J., Phil. Mag., VII, 34, 816, 1943; Nature, 154, 115, 1944.
- (13) Walker, W.S., Phil. Mag. 34 & 35, 486-88, 680-85, 1943, 1944.
- (14) Von Elbe, G.J., Applied Phys. 11, 698-706, 1940.
- (15) David, W.T., Leah, A.S. and Pugh, B., Phil. Mag. XXXI 156, 1941; XXIII, 251, 1937.
- (16) Oldenburg, O., J. Chem. Phys. 7, 485, 1939.
- (17) Ubbelohde, A.R., Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 152, 354, 1935.

- (18) Bone, W.A., Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 114, 402, 442, 1927.
- (19) David, W.T., Phil. Mag. 31, 156, 1941.
- (20) Lewis, B., Combustion Flames and Explosions of Gases, Cambridge, 1938; J. Chem. Phys. 7, 197, 1939.
- (21) Bone, W.A. and Frazer, R.P., Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A ccxxx, 363, 1931; Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A Vol. 228, 223-234, 1929.
- (22) Loah, A.S., Nature, cxlv, 897, 1940.
- (23) Dixon, H.B., Nature, Vol. 124, 580, 1929.
- (24) Hottel, H.C. & Kolitenski, Journal of Applied Mechanics, Temperature Measurements in High Velocity Air Streams, March, 1945.
- (25) Jost, W., Explosion and Combustion Processes in Gases, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946.
- (26) Bailey, N.P. The Thermodynamics of Air at High Velocities, Journal of the Aeronautical Series, Vol. II, No. 3, July 1944.



TABLE NO. 1

## TOTAL AND STATIC PRESSURE TRAVERSE

## DATA FOR FIGURE NO. 1

<u>Distance from Orifice in Inches</u>	<u>P4 Gage</u>	<u>P4 Correction Factor</u>	<u>P4 ABS.</u>	<u>Po4 Gage</u>	<u>Po4 ABS.</u>
0	41.5	<del>/</del> 30.3	71.80	57.2	87.6
.1	25.15	<del>/</del> 30.3	55.45	56.7	87.1
.2	11.4	<del>/</del> 2.2	32.57	56.8	87.2
.3	8.9	- .6	29.7	52.6	83.0
.4	6.9	- 4.6	25.7	49.3	79.7
.5	6.1	- 6.2	24.1	48.9	79.3
.6	12.5	<del>/</del> 6.6	36.9	52.1	82.5
.7	13.1	<del>/</del> 7.8	38.1	55.5	85.9
.8	12.45	<del>/</del> 6.5	36.8	56.3	86.7
.9	9.55	<del>/</del> 0.7	31.0	55.1	85.5
1.0	6.35	- 5.7	24.6	50.3	80.7
1.1	9.2	0	30.3	50.1	80.5
1.2	14.6	<del>/</del> 10.8	41.1	52.1	82.5
1.3	13.5	<del>/</del> 8.6	38.9	55.1	82.5
1.4	8.95	- 0.5	29.8	55.8	86.2
1.5	7.7	- 3.0	27.3	54.5	84.9
1.6	6.2	- 6.0	24.3	51.2	81.6
1.7	9.05	- 0.3	30.0	51.2	81.6
1.8	13.95	<del>/</del> 9.5	39.8	53.0	83.4
1.9	10.4	<del>/</del> 2.4	32.7	55.0	85.4
2.0	7.6	- 3.2	27.1	54.5	84.9
2.1	7.3	- 3.8	26.5	53.7	84.1
2.2	7.0	- 4.4	25.9	51.7	82.1
2.3	8.2	- 2.0	28.3	52.5	82.9
2.4	9.9	<del>/</del> 1.4	31.7	52.5	82.9
2.5	7.8	- 2.8	27.5	49.9	80.3
2.6	7.7	- 3.0	27.3	49.2	79.6
2.7	8.15	- 2.1	28.2	50.2	80.6
2.8	7.9	- 2.6	27.7	50.4	80.8
2.9	8.0	- 2.4	27.9	47.4	77.8
3.0	8.0	- 2.4	27.9	45.2	75.6
3.1	8.2	- 2.0	28.3	43.5	73.9
3.2	9.4	<del>/</del> 0.4	30.7	42.7	73.1
3.3	9.45	<del>/</del> 0.5	30.8	42.5	72.9
3.4	9.3	<del>/</del> 0.2	30.5	41.0	71.4
3.5	9.2	0	30.3	40.3	70.7
3.6	9.4	<del>/</del> .4	30.7	38.7	69.1
3.7	9.5	<del>/</del> .6	30.9	36.9	67.3
3.8	9.5	<del>/</del> .6	30.9	35.4	65.8
3.9	9.5	<del>/</del> .6	30.9	35.2	65.6
4.0	9.45	<del>/</del> .5	30.8	34.0	64.4

P1 = 60" Hg. gage

P12 = 2.95" Hg.

P23 = 1.10" Hg.

P4 Correction Factor = -9.2

Pa = 30.4" Hg.

Orifice = .6"

Fuel = Kerosene

(See Sample Calculations)

P3/Pa = 2.85

To2 = 913° F

To3 = 780° F

TABLE NO. 2  
TOTAL TEMPERATURE TRAVERSE  
DATA FOR FIGURE 2

Dist. From Orifice in Inches	To2 M.V.	To2 oF	To3 M.V.	To3 oF	To4 M.V.	To4 oF
0	21.1	952	17.2	787	15.3	705
.1			17.1	782	15.1	697
.2			"	"	15.2	701
.3			"	"	15.0	692
.4			"	"	15.8	727
.5			"	"	16.0	735
.6			"	"	16.0	735
.7			"	"	16.1	740
.8			"	"	15.8	727
.9			"	"	15.5	714
1.0	21.2	956	17.3	790	16.1	740
1.1			"	"	16.4	752
1.2			"	"	16.3	748
1.3			"	"	16.7	765
1.4			"	"	16.4	752
1.5			"	"	16.2	744
1.6			17.4	795	17.0	778
1.7			17.3	790	17.2	787
1.8			17.4	795	17.3	791
1.9			"	"	17.2	787
2.0	21.3	960	"	"	16.8	769
2.1			"	"	16.6	761
2.2			"	"	16.0	735
2.3			"	"	16.0	735
2.4			"	"	16.3	748
2.5			"	"	16.1	740
2.6			"	"	14.9	688
2.7			17.3	790	14.2	659
2.8			"	"	14.1	655
2.9			"	"	13.8	641
3.0	21.2	956	"	"	13.2	615
3.1			"	"	12.7	594
3.2			17.4	795	12.3	576
3.3			17.3	790	12.1	567
3.4			17.3	790	11.8	555
3.5			17.4	795	11.5	542
3.6			17.3	790	10.9	515

P1 = 60" Hg. gage  
P12 = 2.90" Hg.  
P23 = 1.10" Hg.  
P3/Pa = 2.85

Pa = 30.37" Hg.  
Orifice = .6"  
Fuel = Kerosene

TABLE 2A

## TOTAL TEMPERATURE TRAVERSE

## DATA FOR FIGURE 2A

Distance From Orifice in Inches	To2 M.V.	To2 °F	To3 M.V.	To3 °F	To4 M.V.	To4 °F
0	20.4	922	17.0	778	13.7	636
.1	"	"		"	13.7	636
.2	"	"		"	13.8	641
.3	"	"		"	14.0	650
.4	"	"		"	14.0	650
.5	"	"		"	14.1	654
.6	"	"		"	14.2	658
.7	"	"		"	14.2	658
.8	"	"		"	14.5	671
.9	"	"		"	14.6	675
1.0	"	"		"	14.6	675
1.1	"	"		"	14.6	675
1.2	"	"		"	14.6	675
1.3	"	"		"	14.5	671
1.4	"	"		"	14.6	675
1.5	"	"		"	14.7	680
1.6	"	"		"	14.9	688
1.7	"	"		"	14.9	688
1.8	"	"		"	14.9	688
1.9	"	"		"	15.0	692
2.0	"	"		"	14.9	688
2.1	"	"		"	15.0	692
2.2	"	"		"	15.0	692
2.3	"	"		"	14.9	688
2.4	"	"		"	14.9	688
2.5	"	"		"	14.9	688
2.6	"	"		"	14.9	688
2.7	"	"		"	14.8	684
2.8	"	"		"	14.7	680
2.9	"	"		"	14.6	675
3.0	"	"		"	14.2	658
3.1	"	"		"	14.1	654
3.2	"	"		"		
3.3	"	"		"	13.9	645
3.4	"	"		"		
3.5	"	"		"	13.0	607
3.6	"	"		"		
3.7	"	"		"	12.5	585

P1 = 25."0 Hg gage

P12 = 3.9" Hg

P23 = 1.5" Hg

Pa = 30.35" Hg.

P3/Pa = 1.64

Orifice = .7"

Fuel = Kerosene

TABLE No. 3  
TOTAL TEMPERATURE TRAVERSE  
DATA FOR FIGURE No. 3

Distance From Orifice in Inches	To2 M.V.	To2 °F	To3 M.V.	To3 °F	To4 M.V.	To4 °F
0	24.2	1082	22.3	1002	22.8	1024
.1	"	"	"	"	22.7	1019
.2	"	"	"	"	22.4	1006
.3	"	"	"	"	22.6	1015
.4	"	"	"	"	23.4	1049
.5	"	"	"	"	23.4	1049
.6	"	"	"	"	23.1	1036
.7	"	"	"	"	22.9	1029
.8	"	"	"	"	23.4	1049
.9	"	"	"	"	23.4	1049
1.0	"	"	"	"	23.3	1044

P1 = 59.0" Hg. gage  
P12 = 0.5" Hg.  
P23 = 0.35" Hg.  
P3/Pa = 2.93

Pa = 30.10" Hg.  
Orifice = .4"  
Fuel = Kerosene

0	25.2	1125	22.0	990	20.2	913
.1	"	"	"	"	20.1	910
.2	"	"	"	"	20.2	913
.3	"	"	"	"	20.2	913
.4	"	"	"	"	20.2	913
.5	"	"	"	"	20.1	910
.6	"	"	"	"	20.1	910
.7	"	"	"	"	20.2	913
.8	"	"	"	"	20.1	910
.9	"	"	"	"	20.0	905
1.0	"	"	"	"	19.9	900

P1 = 59.5" Hg. gage  
P12 = .35" Hg.  
P23 = .40" Hg.  
Pa = 29.58

P3/Pa = 2.98  
Orifice = .4"  
Fuel = Hydrogen

TABLE NO. 4

## TOTAL TEMPERATURE TRAVERSE

## DATA FOR FIGURE NO. 4

Distance From Orifice in Inches	To2 M.V.	To2 °F	To3 M.V.	To3 °F	To4 M.V.	To4 °F
0	37.5	1660	32.8	1450	36.9	1631
.1	"	"	"	"	36.9	1631
.2	"	"	"	"	36.9	1631
.3	"	"	"	"	37.0	1635
.4	"	"	"	"	37.3	1650
.5	"	"	"	"	37.5	1659
.6	"	"	"	"	37.2	1645
.7	"	"	"	"	37.3	1650
.8	"	"	"	"	37.5	1659
.9	"	"	"	"	37.3	1650
1.0	"	"	"	"	37.3	1650

P1 = 59.0" Hg. gage

P3/Pa = 2.93

P12 = 0.4" Hg.

Orifice = .4"

P23 = 0.3" Hg.

Fuel = Kerosene

Pa = 30.10" Hg.

0	37.0	1635	33.0	1460	32.8	1450
.1	"	"	"	"	32.7	1445
.2	"	"	"	"	32.7	1445
.3	"	"	"	"	32.7	1445
.4	"	"	"	"	32.8	1450
.5	"	"	"	"	32.8	1450
.6	"	"	"	"	32.6	1442
.7	"	"	"	"	32.4	1433
.8	"	"	"	"	32.3	1428
.9	"	"	"	"	32.0	1415
1.0	"	"	"	"	31.7	1402

P1 = 59.5" Hg. gage

P3/Pa = 2.99

P12 = .4" Hg.

Orifice = .4"

P23 = .15" Hg.

Fuel = Hydrogen

Pa = 29.58

TABLE NO. 5  
STATIC PRESSURE TRAVERSE  
DATA FOR FIGURE NO. 5

Distance From Orifice in Inches	P4 Gage	P4 Correction Factor	P4 ABS
0	49.9	/ 30.1	80.0
.1	33.9	/ 30.1	64.0
.2	13.5	/ 8.8	38.9
.3	4.25	- 9.7	20.4
.4	6.05	- 6.0	24.1
.5	6.30	- 5.6	24.5
.6	14.70	/ 11.2	41.3
.7	8.70	- 0.8	29.3
.8	5.10	- 8.0	22.1
.9	11.90	/ 5.6	35.7
1.0	9.95	/ 1.7	31.8

P1 = 59" Hg. gage    P4 Correction Factor = - 9.1" Hg  
 P12 = 0.4" Hg        P3/Pa = 2.93        To2 = 1660° F  
 P23 = 0.3" Hg        Orifice = .4"        To3 = 1450° F  
 Pa = 30.1" Hg        Fuel = Kerosene

TABLE NO. 6  
TOTAL PRESSURE TRAVERSE  
DATA FOR FIGURE NO. 6

Distance From Orifice in Inches	Po4 Gage	Po4 ABS
0	> 60.	-
.1	> 60.	-
.2	> 60.	-
.3	54.4	84.0
.4	47.1	76.7
.5	51.8	81.4
.6	57.7	87.3
.7	57.8	87.4
.8	50.7	80.3
.9	51.2	80.8
1.0	55.1	84.7

P1 = 59.5" Hg gage    P3/Pa = 2.99    To2 = 1645° F  
 P12 = .3" Hg        Orifice = .4"    To3 = 1460° F  
 P23 = .4" Hg        Fuel = Hydrogen  
 Pa = 29.58

# TOTAL TEMPERATURE VARIATION

TABLE NO. 7

KEROSENE

Press. Ratio P3/Pa	To B.S. °F	To A.S. °F	$\Delta$ To	To Burner °F	Orifice Dia. (Inches)
3.0	1540	1595	55	1330	.4
2.93	1105	1150	45	1000	.4
2.93	1630	1660	30	1450	.4
2.91	860	925	65	1080	.6
2.85	700	740	40	790	.6
2.71	1025	1100	75	1085	.6
2.69	714	748	34	790	.6
2.69	676	700	24	--	.7
2.56	905	950	45	1000	.6
2.53	714	748	34	790	.6
2.51	790	816	26	--	.7
2.40	975	1010	35	1070	.6
2.38	714	740	26	790	.6
2.30	1285	1310	25	1330	.4
2.23	906	914	8	--	.7
2.22	714	736	22	790	.6
2.85	240	249	9	323	.6
2.85	187	200	13	250	.6
2.79	279	289	10	296	.6
2.17	204	208	4	250	.7
2.13	292	293	1	296	.6

To B.S. = total temperature just before first shock.

To A.S. = total temperature just after first shock.

$\Delta$  To = To A.S. - To B.S.

## SAMPLE CALCULATIONS

A. Calculation of time required for a molecule  
to travel from orifice to first shock diamond:

1. Mach number of stream just before first shock.

$$P_{o3} = 60 - 4.05 \div 30.4 = 86.35'' \text{ Hg abs.}$$

$$P_4 \text{ (Just before first shock)} = 22'' \text{ Hg abs.}$$

$$P_{o3}/P_4 = 3.92$$

$$M_4 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\gamma-1} \left[ \left( \frac{P_{o3}}{P_4} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} - 1 \right]} \quad \text{Assume Reversibility (26)}$$

$$M_4 = \sqrt{5.55 [1.436 - 1]} \quad \text{Assume } \gamma = 1.36$$

$$\therefore M_4 = 1.55$$

2. Calculation of time required using max. value

$$\text{of } M_4 = 1.55 \quad T_{o4} = 740 \div 460 = 1200^\circ \text{R}$$

$$M_4 = f \left[ \frac{V_4}{\sqrt{\gamma g R T_{o4}}} \right] = 1.275 \quad \text{FROM REF (26)}$$

$$V_4 = 1.275 \sqrt{1.36 \times 32.2 \times 53.4 \times 1200}$$

$$V_4 = 1.275 \sqrt{2,800,000} = 2130 \text{ Ft/sec.}$$


$$V_4 = 25,600 \text{ INCHES/SEC.}$$

From Fig. (2) distance = .5 in.

$$\therefore t = \frac{\text{distance}}{\text{velocity}} = \frac{.5 \text{ in.}}{25,600 \text{ in/sec}} = \underline{\underline{1.95 \times 10^{-5} \text{ sec.}}}$$



B. Since the values of  $P_4$  fell below atmospheric pressure it was necessary to convert the conventional straight 60" Hg. gage manometer into a modified U tube as shown.



1. Calculations necessary to correct manometer readings.

case (a): -

$$P_4 \text{ (gage, uncorrected)} = 5.0'' \text{ Hg.} \quad P_a = 30.0'' \text{ Hg.}$$

$$9.2'' \text{ Hg.} = \text{Correction factor}$$

$$2 (9.2 - 5.0) = 2 \times 4.2 = 8.4$$

8.4" Hg. is the actual amount which the atmospheric pressure is greater.

$$\therefore P_4 \text{ (absolute, corrected)} = 30.0 - 8.4 = 21.6'' \text{ Hg}$$

case (b): -

$$P_4 \text{ (gage, uncorrected)} = 12.0'' \text{ Hg.}$$

$$2 (12 - 9.2) = 5.6'' \text{ Hg.}$$



$$\therefore P_4 \text{ (absolute, corrected)} = 30.0 + 5.6 = 35.6'' \text{ Hg.}$$

Case (c): -

$$P_4 \text{ (gage, uncorrected)} = 30.0'' \text{ Hg.}$$

$$P_4 \text{ (absolute, corrected)} = 30.0 + 30.0 = 60'' \text{ Hg.}$$

For any reading greater than 18.4, it is only necessary to add the atmospheric pressure to obtain  $P_4$  absolute, corrected.




Key to Plate 1


1. Fuel(kerosene) tank and scale.
2. Fuel gage.
3. Fuel inlet.
4. Fuel valve.
5. Fuel pump.
6. Power Stat, Voltage regulator.
7. Spark plug.

Key to Plate 2

1. Burner.
2. Burner extension.
3. Orifice cap.
4. Sliding plate arrangement.
5. Air metering device.
6. U tube manometer.
7. Potentiometer.
8. Pitot-static tube.
9. Thermocouple selector switch.
10. Bleed off valve.
11. Air supply.
12. Thermocouples -- burner extension.
13. Hydrogen supply.

PLATE No. 2






Key to Plate 3.

1. Burner liner.
2. Spark plug.
3. Hydrogen burner tip.
4. Kerosene burner tip.
5. Fitting to secure and center burner tip in burner.

Key to Plate 4


1. Pitot-static tube.
2. Pitot tube.
3. Thermocouple- stream.
4. .7" orifice.
5. .6" "
6. .5" "
7. .4" "
8. Burner extension.
9. Burner.





# SCHEMATIC SKETCH OF TURNER ASSEMBLY

PLATE NO. V







800  
750  
700  
650  
600  
550  
500

BURNER TEMPERATURE

TOTAL TEMPERATURE  
RISING TO 2

PRESS. RATIO = 2.85

BURNER TEMPERATURE 790°F

KEROSENE

TOTAL TEMPERATURE

DISTANCE FROM ORIFICE IN INCHES

40

30

20


10

8

6

4

2



FROM ORIFICE TO ORIFICE

BARREL LENGTH

1000

HEAD LOSS  
DUE TO FRICTION

HEAD LOSS

5200

2.0

3.0

4.0

DISTANCE FROM ORIFICE IN INCHES

1.0

.8

.6

.4

.2

0

5200

5200

5200

5200

# TOTAL TEMPERATURE TRAVERSE

PIPING NO. 3

Press. Ratio = 2.93

EXPERIMENT

EXPERIMENT

EXPERIMENT

HYDROGEN

DISTANCE FROM ORIFICE IN INCHES

TOTAL TEMP. °F

1050

1000

950

900

0

1

2

3

4

5

6


7

8

9

10





STATIC PRESS. INCHES OF H<sub>2</sub>O

80  
70  
60  
50  
40  
30

0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0

DISTANCE FROM ORIFICE IN INCHES

STATIC PRESSURE TRAVERSE


FIGURE NO. 5

PRESS. TAPING 0.91

ORIFICE TEMP. 140°F

HEAD 50"

DISCHARGE PRESS.






Approx. Pressure Temperature  
 15.0

Approx. Pressure = 17.57 in.

Approx. Pressure = 17.57 in.

Approx. Pressure = 17.57 in.

Approx. Pressure = 17.57 in.



Distance from Orifice in inches


Total Pressure in inches of Hg. Absolute

# TOTAL TEMPERATURE INCREASE VS. PRESSURE RATIO FUEL: M. 7

○ --- BURNER TEMP = 3007-1450°F  
 X --- BURNER TEMP = 2007-300°F

KEROSENE

TOTAL TEMP. INCREASE:  $\Delta T$



PRESSURE RATIO

## DATE DUE

[illegible]

Thesis 11259  
B35 Beers  
Shocks at high temperatures

AG 2159

8670



OPRESS BINDER

BGS 2507

MADE BY

PRODUCTS, INC.

SDENSBURG, N. Y.

in presence of shocks at high temperat



3 2768 002 12945 4  
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY